IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.890 OF 2005

Lalita Prem Prakash Singh ...Petitioner.
Versus
Maniban Nanavati Women's College & 3 Ors. ...Respondents.

....

Mr.Mihir Desai Advocate for the Petitioner.
Ms.Geeta Shastri, A.G.P.,for Respondent No.1.
Mr.Rahul Nerlekar, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

....

CORAM : **F.I.REBELLO AND SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI,JJ.**

DATED : **JUNE 26, 2006.**

P.C.:

. Rule. Heard forthwith.

2. From the reply filed by Mr.Vithoba Wankhede it is clear that the appointment of the petitioner in respondent No.2 institution in the year, 2001 was temporary and against a post reserved for Scheduled Tribe. The petitioner belongs to O.B.C. category as per the affidavit filed by the petitioner. It any rate if the post was reserved for Scheduled Tribe, the petitioner would not be eligible for that post. Subsequently, the petitioner has been appointed by respondent No.1 from year 2001 to 2003 as a Shikshan Sevak. The

reliefs in the Petition are not in respect of her appointment as Shikshan Sevak, but, earlier appointment. On considering the relief sought for in the Petition, this relief cannot be granted. However, it is her grievance that though she has completed three years as Shikshan Sevak, she has not been regularised. In the interest of justice and to avoid multiplicity of proceedings, the following directions :

i. The petitioner to represent to respondent No.3 within 15 days from today in the matter of regularisation and wages as Shikshan Sevak and payment of her salary.

ii. The respondent No.3 thereafter after hearing the petitioner and respondent No.1 to dispose of the same within six days thereafter, by passing necessary orders.

3. Rule made partly absolute accordingly. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

[F.I.REBELLO,J.]

[SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI,J.]